DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 059 TM 830 100

TITLE Report on the Implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program, 1980-81.
INSTITUTION South Carolina State Dept. of Education, Columbia. Office of Research.
PUB DATE Dec 81
NOTE 72p.; For related document, see ED 208 066.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Tests; *Basic Skills; Educational Legislation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Mathematics; Instructional Improvement; Program Implementation; Reading Skills; *School Readiness Tests; *State Programs; Test Construction; *Testing Programs; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *South Carolina Basic Skills Assessment Program

ABSTRACT

In compliance with Section 1 of the South Carolina 1978 Act 631, the following Basic Skills Assessment Program (BSAP) information is reported: (1) the administration of tests for first grade readiness and grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8; (2) the development and field-testing of the 11th grade test; (3) the field-testing of mandated basic skills instructional programs and materials; and (4) the monitoring of instructional components of the BSAP. The readiness test was administered to all first grade students in the fall of 1980. Approximately 64 percent of the students were classified by the readiness test as being "ready" to begin formal first grade instruction. The reading and mathematics tests were administered to grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8; a writing test was administered to grades 6 and 8. Score reports were provided to districts, schools, teachers, and parents so that additional instruction could be provided to students with deficiencies. During 1980-81, pools of test items were developed for grade 11 criterion-referenced tests. The Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Basic Skill Committees reviewed and revised both the test item specifications and test items, prior to field-testing. The results from the field-test will be reviewed and revised by the Basic Skills Committee prior to the statewide administration of the grade 11 test. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BASIC SKILLS ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

1980-81

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. L. Knight

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The South Carolina Department of Education
Charlie G. Williams, State Superintendent
December 1981

Report on the Implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program 1980-81

South Carolina Board of Education
Robert E. Livingston, Chairman

South Carolina Department of Education
Charlie G. Williams, State Superintendent
December, 1981

CONTENTS

Abstract iii

INTRODUCTION 1

ACCOMPLISHMENTS DURING 1980-81 4

TEST ADMINISTRATION - READINESS AND GRADES 1, 2, 3, 6, AND 8 4

Test Administration - Readiness 5

Test Administration - Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 11

TEST DEVELOPMENT - GRADE 11 23

FIELD-TEST OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS 25

INSTRUCTION 27

Monitoring 27

Instructional Activities 28

BASIC SKILLS ADVISORY COMMISSION 31

Appendix A: Basic Skills Resource Materials 33

Appendix B: Membership of the Kindergarten Committee 39

Appendix C: 1980 CSAB Readiness Results 41

Appendix D: Writing Scoring Process, Holistic Scoring Guide, and Analytic Scoring Guide 47

Appendix E: 1981 BSAP Test Results 54

Appendix F: Basic Skills Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Committees 59

Appendix G: Basic Skills Advisory Commission 63

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BASIC SKILLS ASSESSMENT PROGRAM, 1980-81

Abstract

The third year Basic Skills Assessment Program implementation schedule included in Act 631 required four major accomplishments during the 1980-81 school year: (1) the administration of the tests (first grade readiness and Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8); (2) the development or selection and field-testing of the eleventh grade test; (3) the field-testing of basic skills instructional programs and materials mandated in Section 1(b); and (4) monitoring of the instructional components of the Basic Skills Assessment Program. All four activities were completed on schedule.

The readiness test was administered statewide to all first grade students in the fall of 1980. A total of 47,697 first grade students in 585 South Carolina public schools participated in the testing. Approximately 64 percent of the students were classified by the readiness test as being "ready" to begin formal first grade instruction, and approximately 36 percent were classified as being "not ready". The local test results provided teachers with information on those areas for which the first grade students needed additional developmental activities.

The Basic Skills reading and mathematics tests were administered to all students in Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 during the week of May 4-8, 1981. The reading test contained 36 test items, 6 items for each of the 6 reading objectives. The mathematics test contained 30 test items, 6 items for each of the 5 mathematics objectives. A writing test was also administered in Grades 6 and 8. The writing test consisted of presenting each student with a writing prompt and having each student write a paper based upon that prompt. Students

in Grades 1, 2, and 3 demonstrated their highest reading performance on the "Decoding and Word Meaning Objective" with mean scores of 5.4, 5.0, and 5.0, respectively. However, the students in Grades 6 and 8 attained their highest mean reading scores of 4.9 and 4.5, respectively, on the "Reference Usage Objective". In Mathematics, the students in Grades 1, 2, and 3 had their highest mathematics achievement on the objective "Geometry" with mean scores of 5.4, 5.5, and 5.0, respectively. In Grade 6, the highest mean mathematics score was 3.7 in "Problem Solving", and the highest mean mathematics score in Grade 8 was 3.3 in "Operations". In writing, 44 percent of the Grade 6 students and 32 percent of the Grade 8 students scored above the minimum standard. Score reports were provided to districts, schools, teachers, and parents so that additional instruction could be provided to those students who were found to have deficiencies.

During 1980-81, pools of test items were developed for the Grade 11 criterion-referenced tests. The Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Basic Skills Committees, composed of South Carolina educators, reviewed and revised both the test item specifications and test items prior to field-testing. The field-test was conducted in 18 schools in 14 districts in May, 1980. The results from the field-test will also be reviewed and revised by the Basic Skills Committees prior to the statewide administration of the Grade 11 test which is scheduled for the week of May 3-7, 1982.

The field-test of three developmental readiness programs was conducted in six school districts via Title IV-C grants. However, in the Summer of 1981, the legislation was amended from selecting or developing and field-testing instructional programs to providing school districts with information concerning basic instructional programs. These basic instructional programs

must have been proven effective in developing readiness skills or skills in reading, writing, and mathematics.

The Basic Skills Section organized three-member monitoring teams which conducted monitoring visits in 31 school districts. Of the 31 districts monitored in 1980-81, 15 were classified as "in compliance"; 14 were classified as "progressing toward compliance"; and 2 were found to be "not in compliance". In addition to monitoring districts' progress toward compliance, the Department has deliberately directed federal resources to complement the instructional goals and objectives of the Basic Skills movement. The state has also funded child development and parent education programs which serve as support programs for the Basic Skills Assessment Program. Additionally, ten major workshops or conferences were held to provide assistance to districts in the areas of writing, literature, language arts, mathematics, early childhood education, Basic Skills awareness, individualization, test administration, and results utilization.

The 25-member Basic Skills Advisory Commission, under the direction of its chairman, Mr. Wallace Brown, held 10 meetings during 1980-81 and was actively involved in monitoring the development and implementation of the program. In addition to the development and implementation activities, the commission assisted with the 1980 readiness report, worked to acquire adequate funding for the program, and reviewed BSAP plans and materials. The commission also supported the amendments to the legislation, considered a proposal for a longitudinal evaluation of the BSAP, reviewed changes at the Federal level, and heard concerns and comments from individuals and groups such as Headstart and the National Consortium on Testing.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to comply with Section 1(1) of 1978 Act 631, as amended, (Basic Skills Assessment Program) which requires that the State Board of Education, through the State Department of Education, shall "report the results of the program annually to the Governor, the General Assembly, the school districts and to the general public, together with any recommendations of the South Carolina Basic Skills Advisory Commission created pursuant to Section 1A of this Act".

The South Carolina Basic Skills Assessment Program (BSAP) was established by legislation enacted in 1978. Among the major provisions of the legislation which established the BSAP are the requirements that the State Board of Education, through the State Department of Education: (1) establish statewide educational objectives in the basic skills for kindergarten through Grade 12 with minimum standards of student achievement for readiness and for Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 11; (2) select a readiness test to be administered at the beginning of first grade; (3) select or develop criterion-referenced tests in reading and mathematics to be administered at the end of Grades 1, 2, and 3; and (4) select or develop criterion-referenced tests in reading, writing, and mathematics to be administered at the end of Grades 6, 8, and 11.

Additionally, the legislation required the participation of all public school districts in the program (Section 2) and the establishment of a Basic Skills Advisory Commission (Section 1A). The legislation also set forth a schedule for the implementation of the various requirements of the BSAP (Section 4). The law explicitly requires that the results of the testing program be used as a basis for providing appropriate instruction for those

students who do not achieve the minimum standards that are set. None of the tests are related to student promotion/retention or, at this time, the award of a high school diploma. According to the legislated implementation schedule, the test for Grade 11 will be administered for the first time in Spring, 1982.

There are two primary components of the legislation which are highly interrelated: an instructional component and a testing/evaluation component. Hence, the responsibility for implementing the various requirements of the Act is the responsibility of two sections in the Department of Education. The newly created Basic Skills Section, Office of General Education, has as its focus the instructional component; the Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, continues to be responsible for the testing and evaluation component.

During 1980-81, the Basic Skills Section was created. The mission of the Basic Skills Section is to provide direction and leadership to districts for the development, implementation, and evaluation of basic skills programs and services to ensure that effective compensatory and remedial instructional programs are provided in South Carolina's public schools. Included as a function of the section is ensuring the completion of all instructional responsibilities assigned to the State Department of Education through the enactment of the Basic Skills Assessment Act.

The Educational Assessment Section is responsible for carrying out activities related to testing and evaluation. These activities include test item development, test item revision, maintenance of the test item pool, score report development, workshop training for local personnel on how to administer the test, and in-service to district personnel on utilization of test results.

The timetable for the Year 1978-79 required the identification of basic skills objectives and the selection of the readiness test to be administered at the beginning of Grade 1. A description of the first year activities and accomplishments are included in the document, Report on the Implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program, 1978-79. The second year activities, 1979-80, as specified in the timetable, required (1) the administration of the readiness test to all students in first grade and (2) the test development, field-testing, and test item revision for the criterion-referenced tests in Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8. A description of the second year activities and accomplishments are provided in the document, Report on the Implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program, 1979-80.

The timetable in Section 4 requires that the following activities be completed during 1980-81: (1) the administration of the tests (first grade readiness and Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8); (2) the development or selection and field-testing of the eleventh grade test; and (3) the field-testing of basic instructional programs and materials for use to meet the mandates in Section 1(b). Section 8 of the Act also requires a fourth major activity which is an on-going process. This section requires the State Department of Education "to monitor and evaluate the curriculum and instruction methods in each school district, including on-site visits to selected schools, to insure compliance with the standards and purposes of the act". This report provides a summarization of these four 1980-81 activities. The third year accomplishments and activities of the Basic Skills Advisory Commission are also presented in this report. Appendix A provides a list and description of the resource materials that have been developed to supplement the Basic Skills Assessment Program.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS DURING 1980-81

As indicated in the preceding section, the third year schedule required that the readiness test be administered to all first grade students, that criterion-referenced tests based upon the basic skills objectives be administered to all students in Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8; that a criterion-referenced test for Grade 11 be developed, field-tested, and revised; that basic instructional programs be field tested; and that the Department monitor the implementation of the instructional components of the Basic Skills Assessment Program. These third year activities and accomplishments are discussed under the headings "TEST ADMINISTRATION - READINESS AND GRADES 1, 2, 3, 6, AND 8", "TEST DEVELOPMENT - GRADE 11," "FIELD-TEST OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS," and "INSTRUCTION". The accomplishments and activities of the Basic Skills Advisory Commission are given in the final section entitled "BASIC SKILLS ADVISORY COMMISSION.

TEST ADMINISTRATION - READINESS AND GRADES 1, 2, 3, 6, AND 8

As required by the Act, the readiness test was administered to all first graders entering public schools in the Fall of 1980. This administration represented the second readiness testing. Additionally, criterion-referenced Basic Skills Tests were administered to all students in Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 in the Spring of 1981. This administration constituted the first year of basic skills testing. The Educational Assessment Section of the Office of Research was responsible for coordinating and implementing activities related to the readiness and basic skills tests administration.

Test Administration - Readiness

On June 8, 1979, the State Board of Education adopted the Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery (CSAB) as the readiness test to be administered to all entering public school first graders as part of the Basic Skills Assessment Program in accordance with Section 1(b)(1) of Act 631. On July 13, 1979, the cut-off score of 88 out of 117 points was adopted as the minimum standard on the CSAB in accordance with Section 1(a) of Act 631. A list of the Kindergarten Committee members who were instrumental in the objectives establishment and test selection processes are provided in Appendix B.

A detailed report on the first year readiness testing and results is provided in Ready or Not which is available from the Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, upon request. A report on the second year readiness testing and results is provided in Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery (CSAB): Preliminary Results from Fall, 1980, Administration, also available from the Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education.

Statewide Administration and Training

The Fall, 1980, administration of the CSAB constituted the second statewide assessment conducted under the provisions of the 1978 Act 631 (Basic Skills Assessment Program).

To address the need for training, the Educational Assessment Section (Office of Research) assisted by the Curriculum Development and School Services Sections (Office of General Education) utilized three teams to conduct 13 regional workshops during the period of August 11-15, 1980.

Workshops were designed for the following participants from each district: one school representative from each school involved in the readiness testing, the district test coordinator, and three district level staff designated by the district superintendent. To supplement the training, the Department provided each district with a videotape which consisted of three parts: background on the CSAB; actual administration of the CSAB to a child; and discussion of the scoring. Through the use of Department training guides and the videotape, districts provided training to all first grade teachers in the district.

The logistical problems associated with administering an individualized test on a statewide basis were those of most concern to local personnel. With local concerns in mind, the Department was attentive to providing districts with guidelines that could easily be adapted to the special needs of any South Carolina district. The specific dates for testing were left to the discretion of each district. The first requirement was that testing be completed in each district not later than the end of the first 15 days in which any first graders were in attendance in the district. The second requirement was that the CSAB was to be administered by the child's classroom teacher, that is, the teacher to whom the child would be assigned for the entire 1980-81 school year. The benefit of the one-to-one contact between teacher and child would be lost if someone other than the child's teacher administered the test. The Department provided limited funds for paying substitute teachers to attend to children who were not being tested. Additionally, the Department provided districts with several alternatives for meeting the districts' specific needs, including staggered attendance.

All public schools containing first grade classes in South Carolina's 92 districts participated in the Fall, 1980, CSAB readiness assessment. A total of 47,697 first grade children in 585 public schools were administered the CSAB. [Handicapped children were included in testing unless their Individualized Education Program (IEP) indicated that such testing was inappropriate for the child.]

Statewide Results and Implications

Both total group and subgroup results were reported on the CSAB total battery scores for all students tested. The results were reported in terms of percentages of students classified as:

1. "ready", scored 88 or above; or
2. "not ready", scored below 88.

The 1980 statewide readiness results are presented in Appendix C of this report. A detailed discussion of the results is provided in the report, Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery (CSAB): Preliminary Results from Fall, 1980, Administration. The report which provides instructional implications of the Fall, 1979, CSAB data entitled Ready or Not (referenced earlier) also contains valuable interpretive information applicable to the Fall, 1980, data.

A summary of key results and their implications follow:

1. In 1980, 63.7% of South Carolina's first graders were considered "ready" to begin first grade instruction. When compared with the Fall, 1979 figure of 60.2% "ready", an increase of 3.5% between the first and second years of administration of the CSAB is noted.

   Implications: The following hypothesis was formulated: as districts incorporate the State Kindergarten Objectives in their early childhood and kindergarten programs and as a larger proportion of the State's

kindergarten eligibles are enrolled, perhaps the State may realize some increase in the percentages classified as "ready". However, the notion that achieving 100 percent "ready" is both unrealistic and unobtainable from a developmental perspective is reiterated from last year's report. To attempt such a goal would be to ignore individual differences in learning rates. A particular child may not be "ready" to learn a certain concept until after beginning first grade. Nevertheless, the data are encouraging and the changes are definitely in the desired direction.

2. In 1980, the results indicate that 64.7 percent of the students attending public kindergarten, 81.3 percent of the students attending private kindergarten, and 41.2 percent of the students attending Head Start programs as five-year olds were classified as "ready". In 1979, the results were 61.9, 79.2, and 39.2 percent "ready", respectively.
   Implications: Whether or not a child goes to kindergarten, public or private, does seem to have some relationship to readiness. In 1980, 5% of the students tested had not participated in any type of formal educational program as a 5-year-old. In 1979, this figure was 7%. The difference in educational experience as a 5-year-old may account for some of the increase in the overall performance of first graders. Therefore, the results continue to suggest that a concentrated effort at the State, district, and school levels to enroll children in kindergarten programs would be a worthwhile endeavor.
3. The results indicated that 78.8 percent of the students not eligible for either the free or reduced-price lunch program, 67.1 percent on reduced-price lunch programs, and 47.8 percent on free lunch programs

were classified as "ready" in 1980, as opposed to 71.1%, 61.8%, and 42.6%, respectively, in 1979.

Implications: The focus of the explanation for differences in student performance across groups for this variable should probably be on the type of background implied for the child by this variable rather than on the financial aspect of the variable. A variety of situations such as single parent homes, lack of prenatal care, undernourishment, and inadequate exposure to materials and activities that contribute to readiness development may exist for children on free lunch programs. Although the financial aspect may contribute to explaining the observed differences between the three groups, any one or any combination of these situations or related situations may be the actual causal factors. However, the overall increase in performance across groups from one year to the next may be attributable to an instructional effect (i.e., increases of 7.7%, 5.3%, and 5.2%, respectively, for the no lunch, reduced lunch, and free lunch groups).

4. The results indicated that 63.7 percent of the non-repeaters and 63.4 percent of the repeaters were "ready" in 1980, as opposed to 60.5% and 56.7% in 1979.

Implications: What is of interest for instructional planning is not the percentages for non-repeaters but the percentages for repeaters. For the subgroup of children (1,661) who had had a full year of first grade experience, approximately 33 percent were still considered as "not ready" for first grade work in Fall of 1980.

Typically, a child who was a repeater was probably "not ready" for first grade the prior year. Such a child may not have the necessary

foundation either because the child was not exposed to the necessary developmental activities or perhaps because the child was not exposed to such types of activities for a long enough period of time. Educators should make a special effort in their future instructional planning to be attentive to the individual learning needs of such children. The increase of 3.8% of repeaters, from 1979 to 1980, classified as "ready" is encouraging and is perhaps an indication that an attempt to address the individual needs of repeaters is being made.

Actions to Assist "Not Ready" Students

Some districts have expended local funds to employ aides for first grade teachers in order to provide the teachers more time to work with students who need extra assistance. Other districts have initiated programs involving the parents of "not ready" students in activities designed to teach the parents how to help their children at home. Some districts have initiated summer programs to meet the needs of students who, at the end of kindergarten, seemed to be "not ready" for first grade. Still others have provided additional materials for first-grade teachers to use in working with the "not ready" group. Additionally, some school districts have made changes that incorporate two or more of the approaches just mentioned.

The Department of Education has done several things to assist district personnel in meeting the needs of "not ready" students. In-service education for district personnel, the development of resource materials for use by teachers, and the field-testing of instructional programs designed to meet the needs of "not ready" students are among those activities carried out or in progress (refer to "Field-Test of Instructional Programs" and "Instruction").

Resource materials and publications currently available are included in Appendix A. Additional information can be found in "Findings and Recommendations Related to the Kindergarten Objectives and First Grade Readiness Testing", a report based on visits to 20 school districts in which 50 percent or more of the first graders were "not ready" during Fall, 1979. (The report is available from the State Department of Education, Office of General Education.)

Test Administration - Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8

Background

As indicated earlier, the BSAP legislation required the establishment of statewide educational objectives and the use of criterion-referenced tests to assess student performance on those objectives. The objectives which the BSAP tests are designed to measure were identified during the 1978-79 school year. Through a process which involved over 18,000 South Carolina educators, as well as members of the general public, 16 basic skills objectives were identified. The objectives identification process is described in detail in "State Objectives: Reading, Writing, and Mathematics, Grades K-12."

Each of the 16 objectives, 6 in reading, 5 in writing, and 5 in mathematics, is repeated at each grade level in essentially the same form but at a different level of complexity. The brief descriptors for the 16 continuing objectives in the three subject areas are presented below. By perusing these descriptors and then recalling that each objective occurs at each grade level, but at a different level of complexity, an overview of the

continuing objectives that constitute the core of the South Carolina Basic Skills Assessment Program is possible.

READING	WRITING	MATHEMATICS
Decoding and Word Meaning	Handwriting	Concepts
Details	Mechanics	Operations
Main Idea	Word Usage	Measurement
Reference Usage	Sentence Formation	Geometry
Inference	Composition	Problem Solving
Analysis of Literature		

Each of the objectives, at each grade level, is accompanied by a suggested measurement strategy which indicates the possible shifts in content and skills at the various grades.

As a part of the test development process, the skills and subskills reflected in each objective were further defined and decisions were made regarding the appropriate grade placement of each skill and subskill. Test items were then developed to assess the specific skills and subskills related to each of the objectives. The test items were reviewed and revised by South Carolina educators, field-tested, and, if necessary, further revised and submitted for re-field-testing. Some of the items which survived the first field-testing without furtner revision were utilized in the tests which were administered in Spring, 1981.

Description of the BSAP Tests

The BSAP tests were devised to assess student mastery of the educational objectives which were identified during the 1978-79 school year. In each grade tested, the reading and mathematics tests consisted of 6 multiple-choice items for each of the objectives. Consequently, the reading and mathematics tests at all grades consist of 36 and 30 items, respectively. The writing

tests in Grades 6 and 8 require that students write compositions in response to a specific assignment. In Grades 6 and 8, the writing may require either description, narration, or exposition. (The eleventh grade test, although not yet included in the assessment program, will require persuasive writing in addition to description, narration, and exposition.) Students are given 50 minutes to complete the writing tests. The reading and mathematics tests are not timed.

The reading level, content, and format of all test items were carefully controlled during the development process through the use of item specifications, that is, highly detailed descriptions of the test items. All vocabulary in the reading selections used on the tests is restricted to that appropriate for the grade being assessed. In the case of the mathematics tests, the reading level is at least one grade below the level at which the test is administered. For example, the third grade mathematics test uses second grade or lower vocabulary. The only exception are first grade tests which have a reading level of first grade. The mathematics tests were constructed in this manner to increase the probability that mathematics skills rather than reading skills were being measured. In other words, keeping the vocabulary below grade level provides an opportunity to obtain a more accurate assessment of a student's mathematics achievement. However, students with severe deficiencies in reading will still have difficulty with the vocabulary. Since the BSAP legislation requires that the tests remain secure, new forms of the tests will be created each year.

Test Administration Procedures

Pretest workshops were scheduled at regional sites throughout South Carolina during the week of April 6-10, 1981. Invited were (1) one

representative from each school conducting BSAP testing, (2) the distrtict test coorginator, and (3) two additional members of the school district staff.

Four teams composed of staff members from both the Educational Assessment Section and the Basic Skills Section conducted 17 regional meetings for 1,192 participants.

Teacher administration manuals and test booklets were color-coded by the five grades involved in testing so as to provide visual identification for teachers. An oral administration script was provided for Grades 1, 2, and 3 teachers to facilitate testing. Major portions of the workshop presentation involved security procedures and make-up testing. An open-ended teacher comment form was enclosed in each administration manual to allow feedback to the Department concerning any aspect of the testing such as test items and administration procedures. A coding system on the testing forms allowed a student's report to go to the school where the student would be enrolled in the fall.

Every teacher involved in the testing was provided with a teacher's administration manual to facilitate training. In addition, at least one test coordinator's manual was provided per school. Other materials were developed to be used with the Grade 11 field-testing and the re-field-testing of the Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 items. The materials developed include the following.

1. Test Coordinator's Manual, Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 - This manual provided administration procedures for district and school test coordinators of BSAP testing in Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8. The manual was divided into three sections: Before Testing, During Testing, and After Testing. The Before Testing section provided for receipt of materials at the district and school level so as to maximize the security needed for testing. In addition to providing the distribution and collection procedures, the During Testing portion

also called for monitors during testing. In the After Testing section, make-up testing, return of materials, and availability of scoring services were covered. Samples of forms and answer sheets associated with BSAP testing were included in the appendix of the Test Coordinator's Manual.

2. Teacher's Administration Manual, Grade 1, Grade 2, Grade 3, Grade 6, Grade 8 - Separate Teacher's Administration Manuals were provided for each of the five grades tested. The title and grade on the cover of the manuals were color-coded by grade. Also color coded by grade was the oral administration script used in Grades 1, 2, and 3. The Teacher's Administration Manuals were organized in the same manner as the Test Coordinator's Manual. As was the case with the Test Coordinator's Manual, samples of appropriate forms, including the class sheet, answer sheet, and teacher comment form, were enclosed.

3. Field-Test Test Coordinator's Manual, Grades 1-8 - The Field-Test Test Coordinator's Manual, Grades 1-8, contained Before Testing, During Testing, and After Testing sections. Procedures were similar to the Grades 1-8 statewide BSAP testing. Procedures for the field-testing were somewhat simplified because there was no make-up testing.

4. Teacher's Field-Test Administration Manual - The Teacher's Field-Test Administration Manuals contained instructions for administration of the tests, were color-coded for the five grades, and contained oral administration scripts for Grades 1-3.

5. Field-Test Test Coordinator's and Administrator's Manual, Grade 11 - The coordinator's and administrator's manuals were combined for the Grade 11 field-test inasmuch as no oral script was needed and testing was occurring at only one grade level. Many of the procedures were identical to Grades 1-8 testing. However, a separate answer sheet was provided for the Grade 11 testing.

Achievement Standards

The BSAP legislation requires that minimum standards of achievement be set for readiness and for reading, writing, and mathematics in Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 11. At this time, the only standards that have been established are those for readiness at the beginning of Grade 1 and for writing in Grades 6, 8, and 11. The standards for reading and mathematics in Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 will be set during the 1981-82 school year prior to the Spring, 1982, administration of the tests. The reading and mathematics standards for Grade 11 will be set prior to the Spring, 1983, administration.

The minimum standards for writing have been set since the standards are inherent in the system used for scoring the writing papers. The writing tests are scored on a 0 to 4 scale on which the points are defined as follows:

4 points = a more than adequate response;
3 points = an adequate response;
2 points = a less than adequate response;
1 point = a very inadequate response; and
0 points = a response that cannot be evaluated.

(A more complete definition of the scale points and the scoring process is given in Appendix D.)

Papers which receive a score of 3 or more are judged as adequate and those which receive a score of less than 3 are judged inadequate. Papers which receive scores of less than adequate are also checked for specific deficiencies related to the Statewide Writing Objectives.

Cautions in the Interpretation and the Use of the Data

Since the BSAP tests were developed for South Carolina, there is no information available that indicates how students in other states or in the nation as a whole would perform on the BSAP tests. Hence, the BSAP tests can be used for comparing student performance to a standard of performance but not for comparing students with one another.

The BSAP tests were developed specifically for use in South Carolina and are intended as a means of identifying student deficiencies so that the deficiencies can be corrected through appropriate instruction. Since performance standards for reading and mathematics have not yet been set, the results can best be interpreted in terms of relative strengths and weaknesses reflected in the data for the various objectives and basic skill areas.

Another area in which caution needs to be exercised is in the interpretation of the data that deals with differences in the performance of various subgroups within the total population at any grade. While data for various subgroups can provide information as to which of the subgroups, as a whole, may be most in need of additional instruction, the data cannot appropriately be used as a basis for making cause and effect statements.

Results for Spring, 1981

The May, 1981, administration of the BSAP tests included 234,342 students in Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8. The number of students tested by grade was as follows: Grade 1 - 47,584; Grade 2 - 45,637; Grade 3 - 47,075; Grade 6 - 46,805; and Grade 8 - 47,241. Students who were receiving special services because of handicapping conditions were included in the testing unless their Individual Education Plans (IEP), as required by P.L. 94-142, indicated that the tests would be inappropriate.

For 1981, the scores on the reading and mathematics tests are reported in raw score units, i.e. the number of correct responses. In subsequent years, the results will probably be reported in a different metric such as scale scores. Scores on the writing tests are reported on a 0-4 scale which is explained in Appendix D. Papers with assigned scores of 3 or above are judged to be above the minimum standard, and papers with assigned scores of less than 3 are below the minimum standard.

Since the results of the reading and mathematics tests are reported in terms of the number of correct responses, the temptation is to interpret the data by applying a convention such as 70% correct as "passing". The data

should not be interpreted in that manner since the use of 70% would be arbitrary and would fail to take into consideration the difficulty of the tests. Additionally, a 70% passing standard may be totally unrelated to the required minimum achievement standards once those standards are set.

The body of this report contains summary data for all students. A more complete breakdown of the data can be found in Appendix E.

Table I of Appendix E includes the mean and median raw scores by grade for each reading and mathematics objective and for each of the total tests. When examining the data in Table I, remember that each of the reading tests was composed of 36 items and each mathematics test consisted of 30 items. At this time, comparing either reading or mathematics achievement across grades or comparing reading and mathematics achievement within grades would be inappropriate. Such comparisons would almost certainly lead to erroneous conclusions since the tests have not been equated either across grades or subject areas. This necessarily restricts meaningful comparisons to relative strengths and weaknesses within subject areas within grades.

Reading Results. In reviewing the contents of Table I, attention is directed first to the data for the reading test. In terms of mean raw scores, students in Grades 1, 2, and 3 demonstrated highest achievement on the "Decoding and Word Meaning" objective with mean scores of 5.4, 5.0, and 5.0, respectively. In all three grades, the median raw score, the point which 50% of the students scored above and 50% scored below, is somewhat higher than the mean for "Decoding and Word Meaning". Since the tests contained six items per objective, the medians of 5.8, 5.3, and 5.5 suggest that the students in Grades 1, 2, and 3 performed very well on these items.

Students in Grades 6 and 8 attained their highest mean scores, 4.9 and 4.5, respectively, on the "Reference Usage" objective. Again, the corresponding median scores of 5.3 and 4.9 are higher than the respective means. In fact, a thorough examination of the reading scores reveals that in only two instances, "Analysis of Literature" for Grades 1 and 6, is the median score equal to or less than the mean. Consequently, on all reading objectives with the exception of "Analysis of Literature" in Grades 1 and 6, over 50% of the students scored above the group average.

The lowest areas of reading achievement, based on mean scores, were "Analysis of Literature" for Grades 1, 6, and 8; and "Main Idea" for Grades 2 and 3. The reader is cautioned to remember that the term "lowest achievement" as used here identifies the areas of relative weakness. For example, in Grade 1, achievement on the "Analysis of Literature" objective was relatively weak when compared with scores on the objective dealing with "Decoding and Word Meaning".

Mathematics Results. Table I also includes data on achievement in mathematics. Before examining specific data, however, the reader is reminded that, in contrast to the 36 item reading tests, the mathematics tests each consisted of 30 items.

As evidenced by the mean scores of 5.4, 5.5, and 5.0 for Grades 1, 2, and 3, respectively, the highest mathematics achievement was obtained on the objective dealing with "Geometry". (Although geometry is frequently thought of as a branch of mathematics taught only at the secondary school level and above, the primary grades include instruction in the identification of geometric shapes and the symmetrical division of such shapes.) In Grade 6, the highest mean score, 3.7, was obtained in "Problem Solving". In Grade 8, "Operations" was highest with a mean of 3.3.

As is the case with reading, the median scores for mathematics in Grades 1, 2, and 3 are consistently higher than the means. Again, this indicates that over 50% of the first, second, and third grade students are grouped toward the upper end of the score distribution. This situation changes somewhat in Grades 6 and 8 where, in eight out of ten cases, the median is either equal to or less than the mean. In instances where the median is less than the mean, more than 50% of the students scored below the group average.

Returning to relative strengths and weaknesses, "Operations" was the common area of relative weakness for first, second, and third graders. Sixth and eighth graders, on the other hand, apparently had more difficulty with test items related to the "Geometry" objective.

Writing Results. Table II provides information on the numbers and percentages of students scoring "above standard" and "below standard" on the writing tests in Grades 6 and 8. Since the minimum standards for writing achievement are defined by the scoring criteria (Appendix D), the data for writing, unlike that for reading and mathematics, provide specific information on the numbers and percentages of students that must be provided appropriate basic instruction.

As indicated in Table II, 44% of the sixth grade students and 32% of the eighth grade students scored above the minimum standard. Consequently, 56% of the sixth graders and 68% of the eighth graders were identified as needing additional instruction in writing in order to meet the minimum standards. The general nature of the additional instruction needed is indicated in Table III. For example, the data in Table IV indicate that of the 26,195 sixth graders who scored below the standard, the percentage of deficiencies by objective was as follows: Mechanics - 85%; Word Usage - 68%; Sentence Formation - 87%; and Composition - 28%.

Implications - Reading, Mathematics, and Writing - Differences in achievement across objectives within a subject area for a particular grade may be partially explained by one or more of the following: (1) the skills and subskills reflected in some objectives may be inherently more difficult than those included in other objectives; (2) some objectives receive greater instructional emphasis than others; and (3) test items, on the average, may not have been of equal difficulty across objectives.

In cases such as Grade 8 mathematics where achievement appears generally low on all objectives, the overall achievement level may be partially explained by: (1) lack of match between the test and instruction because some skills are not yet being taught or (2) difficulty of the test items as influenced by the item content and the complexity of skills being assessed.

Recall that the objectives on which the tests were based reflect South Carolinian's views on desired learning outcomes at each grade---not necessarily what is currently being taught. Consequently, there may be, in some instances, an initial lack of congruence among the tests and curriculum and instruction. Any lack of agreement among curriculum and instruction and test content will, in the early stages of program implementation, result in lower test scores. Assuming some initial lack of agreement, there should be an improvement in performance on the tests as adjustments are made in curriculum and instruction. If the tests had been designed to measure only the curriculum and instruction in place at the time of test development, the tests would not promote change in either curriculum or instruction.

As mentioned earlier, differences in achievement across objectives within a subject area may be partially attributable to some objectives receiving

greater instructional emphasis than others. Although all objectives are assessed at each grade level, the relative importance of the objectives and the amount of instructional time each receives may differ within and across grade levels. For example, the time spent on "Decoding and Word Meaning" will probably be greater in the primary grades than in the upper elementary and secondary grades.

Again, caution is extended against comparing performance across grades in any of the subject areas since the tests have not been equated across grades and are not necessarily of equivalent difficulty. For example, the sixth grade writing assignment required that students write a narrative paper while the eighth grade assignment required an expository paper. Since exposition may be inherently more difficult than narration, the performance of sixth and eighth graders should not be compared.

The poor overall performance on the writing tests in both Grades 6 and 8 may be largely attributable to the students lack of familiarity with the type of assignment or a lack of match between the tests and instruction. As students become more familiar and comfortable with the writing process as it relates to the required types of writing, the overall performance should improve considerably.

Summary

The data from the 1981 administration of the BSAP tests should be considered as baseline, i.e. data against which future performance can be compared. The data can be used, as intended, for instructional purposes and as a basis for examining curricular and instructional emphasis. The data should not be used for making judgments about the quality of instructional

programs since the instructional objectives on which the tests were based were identified during the 1978-79 school year and were not available to school district personnel until after the beginning of the 1979-80 school year. Additionally, "Teaching and Testing our Basic Skills Objectives", a document which defines the specific skills and subskills identified for each grade, was published in limited numbers during the 1980-81 school year in order to obtain teachers' suggestions for revision. The revised document will be made available to all language arts and mathematics teachers during the 1981-82 school year and should be a valuable resource for instructional improvement.

TEST DEVELOPMENT - GRADE 11

Since the Basic Skills legislation requires that the Department maintain security on all basic skills tests as specified in Section 1(i) of Act 631, the Department decided to develop and field-test pools of test items for each basic skills objective rather than develop and field-test a single test for Grade 11. The development of pools of test items for each reading, writing, and mathematics objective would permit the creation of several alternate tests of equivalent difficulty. This procedure permits the use of different tests each year, and, consequently, reduces problems associated with the possible loss of security on any one of the tests. Once the test development strategy had been decided upon, the Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, undertook the task of coordinating all activities related to the item pool development, including development of test item specifications, writing of test items, committee review of test items, and field-testing.

Instructional Objectives Exchange (IOX), the contractor that had assisted the Department in the identification of the Grades 1-12 Objectives during

1978-79 and in test development for Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 in 1979-80, continued as the test development contractor for the Grade 11 test.

The first step in the test development process was the creation of a "Framework" for the Development of the Grade 11 test items. The "Framework" was developed by IOX and submitted to the Department for approval. The "Framework" addressed the manner in which various issues such as cultural bias, adult-functional competency, and reading level were to be dealt with during the test development process.

Upon approval of the "Framework" by the Department, IOX began developing the preliminary test item specifications or the blueprints from which the Grade 11 test items would be created. The preliminary test item specifications were based on the previously identified Basic Skills Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Objectives within the constraints imposed by the "Framework". Basically, the specifications clearly defined the content that was appropriate for inclusion on the test and such things as the appropriate reading level, the skills and subskills to be assessed, the maximum length of reading passages, and acceptable item types. The same subskills that were identified for the Grades 1, 2, 3, 6, and 8 objectives were also used for the Grade 11 test items.

Once completed, the preliminary test item specifications were submitted to Department staff and the Basic Skills Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Committees, composed of South Carolina educators, for review and revision. Department staff and the Basic Skills Committees reviewed and revised the preliminary test item specifications in October of 1979. (Refer to Appendix F for a listing of the Basic Skills Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Committee members.)

The Writing Committee decided that the writing tests for Grade 11 should also consist of student generated writing samples, as in the case of Grades 6 and 8. Additionally, all four types of writing that had been identified would be assessed: narration, description, exposition, and persuasion. Thus, writing prompts rather than multiple-choice test items were developed for the assessment of writing skills.

Based upon Department and committee input, the preliminary test item specifications were revised; and the preliminary test items for Grade 11 were developed. These preliminary test items were submitted to Department staff and the Basic Skills Committees for review and revision. Based upon the input of these two groups, the test items were finalized and field-tested on a representative sample of South Carolina students. The field-test sample consisted of students located in 18 schools in 14 districts across the State. The field-test served to identify faulty test items and to provide indices of item difficulty. During 1981-82, the data from the field-test will be analyzed and reviewed by Department staff and the Basic Skills Committees for the purpose of eliminating and revising faulty items and constructing alternate forms of the three tests.

The first statewide administration of the end of year Grade 11 criterion-referenced test will occur in the Spring of 1982.

FIELD-TEST OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

The timetable for the implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program required the State Department of Education to include in its activities the field-testing of instructional programs. Accordingly, the Department selected and field-tested three developmental programs during the

school year, 1980-81. Programs selected were those expected to meet the requirements of Section 1(b) of the Act that specified the provision of appropriate developmental programs for students not manifesting readiness to begin the formal school curriculum.

Districts selected to participate in the field-test were those applying for developmental program grants under the guidance of Title IV-C. Hence, this activity was a coordinated effort between the Offices of Research and Federal Programs. Staff from the Educational Assessment Section designed the study and wrote a Request for Proposals (RFP) which was submitted to the Office of Federal Programs for Review and approval. This RFP was submitted to the superintendents of all 92 school districts. In selecting districts that would participate, primary consideration was given to those whose student population resembled that population found in the State's public school system. Six districts were selected to implement one of the three programs. When selection was complete, each program was chosen by two districts so that all three were field-tested by two districts. The field-test also required the use of control schools whose populations were similar to participating schools. Control schools could only be schools that did not use any of the three programs involved.

Evaluation of program effectiveness was conducted by a team from the College of Education, University of South Carolina. A complete evaluation report is forthcoming.

Section 1(n) of the BSAP Act also required the field-testing of basic instructional programs in reading, writing, and mathematics during the school years 1980-81 through 1984-85. In the amended act, however, Section 1(n) was changed from selecting or developing and field-testing instructional programs

to "provide school districts with information concerning basic instructional programs which have been demonstrated to be effective in developing readiness skills or in the teaching of reading, writing, and mathematics. The Department of Education shall encourage school districts to adopt programs that are determined to be appropriate to the needs of their students." Thus, the Department's role concerning instructional programs will change from implementor to advisor.

INSTRUCTION

From an instructional perspective, the Basic Skills Assessment Program will increasingly impact upon public school programs and practices during each year of implementation. Following is a discussion of the activation of the monitoring process, as well as a discussion of the major instruction related activities for 1980-81.

Monitoring

The Basic Skills Assessment Act (Section 8) mandates that the Department of Education monitor and evaluate "the curriculum and instructional methods" of South Carolina school districts to ensure compliance with its provisions. During 1980-81, a monitoring process was designed and implemented by the Basic Skills Section staff members.

To accomplish the required monitoring, the staff of the Basic Skills Section was organized into rotating three member teams consisting of reading and mathematics specialists, plus a third consultant with general expertise. These teams conducted Basic Skills Assessment Programs monitoring visits in 31 school districts. Through interviews with principals and classroom teachers,

as well as observation of instruction and review of records, team members collected data that were utilized in classifying districts as "in compliance", "progressing toward compliance", or "not in compliance" with the requirements of the Act. Of the 31 districts monitored in 1980-81, 15 were classified "in compliance"; 14 were classified as "progressing toward compliance"; and 2 were found to be "not in compliance".

As a follow-up to each monitoring visit, a detailed report was prepared and returned to each district superintendent. These reports contain very specific recommendations on the staff development and program improvement activities that should aid in full program implementation. Where possible, available resources that can assist in implementing team recommendations are identified.

Instructional Activities

The State Department of Education has committed both human and financial resources to provide instructional leadership activities that are designed to assist districts in the full implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program. Following is a summary of some of the major instructional activities that have occurred during the period covered by this report.

Special Instructional Programs (Federal)

To assist districts in the implementation of the requirements of the Basic Skills Assessment Act, the Department staff has deliberately directed federal resources to complement the instructional goals and objectives of the Basic Skills movement. Supportive federal activities include:

1. ESEA, Title II - funded 15 Basic Skills Mini-Grants to initiate or expand staff or curriculum development activities;

2. ESEA, Title IV-C - funded 60 Nationally Validated Replication Projects. In excess of 2,200 teachers received training. Program implementation is impacting on over 50,000 students; and

3. ESEA, Title IV-C - funded 4 Developmental Projects:

   a. Charleston, Diagnosing Cognitive Deficiencies in Mathematics - This project resulted in the development of a K-12 mathematics testing program that is designed to diagnose students' individual instructional needs enabling teachers to provide appropriate instruction.

   b. Greenville, Write Right: Innovative Techniques for Language Arts Personnel - Through this project a K-12 teacher training program is being developed that will assist teachers in teaching and evaluating the composition skills of students.

   c. Richland I, Math for Employment - This state validated program currently in use in over 50 schools throughout the state, resulted in a revision of the general mathematics program.

   d. Richland II, Reading Competencies for Language Arts Personnel Project - Staff, in conjunction with State Department Consultants, are creating staff development training modules designed to convey identified competencies in four areas of specialization (classroom teacher, Prevention/Remedial teacher, reading clinician, and reading supervisor).

Special Instructional Programs (State)

The state funded child development and parent education programs are supportive of the Basic Skills Program. Priority for funding is given to those districts with high incidences of children scoring "not ready" on the Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery. During 1980-81, 23 districts operated comprehensive child development programs serving 1,861 three-, four-, and five-year old children while the school-based parent education program operated in 262 schools involving approximately 7,000 parents of young children. Four districts received funds to establish home-based parent education programs. Parents receive individual attention and assistance at home that is designed to assist them in understanding and encouraging the development of their young children.

Workshops/Conferences

Workshops and conferences are frequently utilized to disseminate information on training to assist districts with the instructional aspects of the Basic Skills Assessment Program. Following is information on several conferences and workshops.

1. Statewide Writing Conferences
   Local district educators participated in two statewide conferences which addressed successful approaches for the teaching and evaluating of writing. The 400 participants represented both the elementary and secondary levels.

2. Literature Conferences
   Two statewide literature conferences, one for elementary and one for the middle grades, were sponsored. Approximately 400 district educators attended each conference. The conferences addressed the incorporation of children's literature into the language arts curriculum.

3. Summer Writing Workshop
   During the summer, a writing workshop, attended by 45 educators from 21 districts, was held to provide educators with techniques for teaching the writing process. The workshop offered the participants graduate and/or certificate renewal credit.

4. Language Arts Liaison Meetings
   Fall and Spring regional conferences were held for the districts language arts and reading representatives. The fall conference focused on oral language while the spring conference emphasized listening skills.

5. Early Childhood Education Summer Institute
   Over 200 educators participated in a week-long early childhood summer institute which was offered for graduate and inservice credit. The focus of this institute was on techniques and suggestions for expanding the early childhood curriculum.

6. Basic Skills Awareness Conference
   Twenty nationally validated programs focusing on the improvement of basic skills instruction were presented at an awareness conference which was attended by 332 district representatives. All programs presented were available for replication with federal funds.

7. Individualization Conference
   During the conference, 225 educators from 37 school districts participated in sessions which focused on the teaching skills necessary for implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program.

8. Basic Skills Test Administration and Utilization Workshops
District representatives attended regional workshops for training in test administration and utilization.

9. Basic Skills Program Update for Teacher Educators
The conference was sponsored to update teacher educators on the Basic Skills Assessment Program and to provide them with materials that could be incorporated and related to the training opportunities provided future educators. The 102 participants represented 20 institutions of higher education.

10. Basic Skills Liaison Network Meetings
The Basic Skills Liaison Network meets twice annually. Information on the Basic Skills Assessment Program is shared with instructional leadership personnel from the 92 school districts.

District Inservice

Department of Education Curriculum Consultants are frequently requested to conduct inservice training activities related to the Basic Skills Assessment Program. Since the Basic Skills Section was established in November, 1980, the staff has conducted 91 inservice sessions specifically related to the Basic Skills Assessment Program. In excess of 3,150 classroom teachers and administrators have received training.

BASIC SKILLS ADVISORY COMMISSION

Activities

The Basic Skills Advisory Commission, created by Act 631, consists of 25 members. Appointments to the Commission are made by the Governor, the State Superintendent of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. During 1980-81, the Commission held 10 meetings and was actively involved in monitoring the development and implementation of the program.

Activities of the Commission included the following: 1) working with Department of Education staff in developing the report of the results of the Fall 1980 readiness testing; 2) working with members of the General Assembly in support of adequate funding for implementing the program; 3) reviewing plans and materials developed by the Department of Education; 4) supporting necessary amendments to the Basic Skills legislation; 5) considering a proposal for a longitudinal evaluation of the BSAP; 6) reviewing changes at the Federal level which may have implications for the BSAP; and 7) hearing concerns and comments from various groups and individuals, including representatives of Headstart and the National Consortium on Testing. A listing of the Commission membership for 1980-81 is provided in Appendix G.

Appendix A

Basic Skills Resource Materials

Videotapes, Current Publications, and Forthcoming Publications

Videotapes

1. Ready, Set, Go: Training for Cognitive Skills Assessment Battery, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, Revised, 1980.*

   This is a video-cassette tape that offers recommended administration and scoring procedures for the first grade readiness test.

2. "Let's Get Started: First Grade Readiness Activities", Office of General Education, State Department of Education, 1980.*

   This is a video-cassette tape of a first grade teacher's classroom management techniques that insures appropriate attention to student deficiencies. The tape also includes segments showing studentsengaged in developmental activities, each of which addresses a specifically identified readiness skill.

*For the availability of ITV showings, consult ITV and Radio Staff Development Resources and Schedules for the current year.

Current Publications

1. A Handbook for Understanding the Basic Skills Assessment Program, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, December, 1980.

   This handbook provides an explanation and interpretation of each section of the Basic Skills Assessment Program Act. Answers to questions from local administrators and teachers are also addressed.

2. Building Composition Skills, Office of General Education, South Carolina Department of Education, May, 1981.

   This publication is for language arts teachers, Grades 1-12, and contains recommendations for teaching composition. Sections are included on the interrelationships of language arts, the writing process, and the place of writing in the total curriculum. A list of selected references and suggestions for parents to help their child become a better writer are also included.

3. Learning Through Play: A Guide for Parents of 3-, 4-, or 5-Year Olds, South Carolina Department of Education, 1980.

   This publication contains developmental activities keyed to the 18 State Kindergarten Objectives. The activities were designed specifically for the parents of 3-, 4-, or 5-year olds and can easily be done at home.

Current Publications (Continued)

4. Parent Activities for Learning Basic Skills, Office of General Education, South Carolina Department of Education, January, 1979.

   This publication is a collection of learning activities prepared to help parents reinforce learning in the basic skills of reading and mathematics for children in Grades K-3. This publication is intended to enhance the involvement of parents in the learning process of their children through positive home/school interaction.

5. Ready or Not: A Report on the 1979 Statewide Readiness Test Administration and Results, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, October, 1980.

   This publication presents interpretive information, along with the first year results of the 1979 Statewide Readiness Test Administration. Information on instructional implications and local reactions to the first year administration are also included.

6. Report on the Implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program, 1978-79, South Carolina Department of Education, December, 1979.

   This publication is a report to the legislature on the progress the Department made in its effort to comply with the Basic Skills Assessment Program legislation time schedule for Year 1 (1978-79).

7. Report on the Implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program, 1979-80, South Carolina Department of Education, December, 1980.

   This publication is a report to the legislature on the progress the Department made in its effort to comply with the Basic Skills Assessment Program legislation time schedule for Year 2 (1979-80).

8. South Carolina Word List, prepared by Instructional Objectives Exchange for the South Carolina Department of Education, November, 1981 (Third Printing).

   This publication contains a by-grade-level listing of words used in developing the Basic Skills Assessment Program Tests in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics. Note that for testing certain skills, words that are not on this list may be used.

9. State Objectives, Reading, Writing, and Mathematics, Grades K-12, South Carolina Department of Education, November, 1981 (Third Printing).

   This publication contains a listing of the 18 kindergarten objectives with their accompanying explanations and the 16 Basic Skills Objectives for Reading, Writing, and Mathematics with their accompanying measurement strategies.

Current Publications (Continued)

10. Teaching and Testing Our Basic Skills Objectives, Reading, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, September, 1981.

    This publication (referred to as T & T) is for teachers in Grades 1-9 and provides them with a tool for curriculum and instructional development that is consistent with the assessment of the State Objectives in Reading. This guide provides a summary of how each objective is tested and how this information can be translated into activities for teaching basic skills. There are three different books in the Reading T & T Series, one for each of three grade ranges: T & T Reading, Grades 1, 2, 3; T & T Reading, Grades 4, 5, 6; and T & T Reading, Grades 7 & 8.

11. Teaching and Testing Our Basic Skills Objectives, Mathematics, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, September, 1981.

    This publication (referred to as T & T) is for teachers in Grades 1-9 and provides them with a tool for curriculum and instructional development that is consistent with the assessment of the State Objectives in Mathematics. This guide provides a summary of how each objective is tested and how this information can be translated into activities for teaching basic skills. There are three different books in the Mathematics T & T Series, one for each of three grade ranges: T & T Mathematics, Grades 1, 2, 3; T & T Mathematics, Grades 4, 5, 6; and T & T Mathematics, Grades 7 & 8.

12. Teaching and Testing Our Basic Skills Objectives, Writing, Pilot Edition, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, October, 1981.

    This publication (referred to as T & T) is for teachers in Grades 5-12 and provides them with a tool for curriculum and instructional development that is consistent with the assessment of the State Objectives in Writing. This guide provides a summary of how each objective is tested and how this information can be translated into activities for teaching basic skills.

13. The Rainbow Book for First Grade, Office of General Education, South Carolina Department of Education, 1980.

    This publication contains developmental activities based on the 18 State Kindergarten Objectives. The activities were written specifically for first grade teachers to use with first graders in bringing them into the formal curriculum as learning and maturity dictate.

Forthcoming Publications

1. A Handbook for Understanding the Basic Skills Assessment Program, Update I, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, March, 1982.*

   This handbook is a revised version of the original handbook and presents information relative to the new amendments, updates previous information, and addresses additional questions from local administrators and teachers.

2. Kangaroo, Basic Skills Section, Office of General Education, South Carolina Department of Education, December, 1981.*

   This book contains activities keyed to the 18 State Kindergarten Objectives and is intended for use by kindergarten teachers.

3. Ready or Not, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, February, 1982.*

   This report will present information relative to the administration and the results of the readiness testing for the three years of its administration, 1979, 1980, and 1981.

4. Report on the Implementation of the Basic Skills Assessment Program, 1981-82, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, January, 1982.*

   This report will describe the completed activities of the Department relative to compliance with the time schedule for Year 3 (1981-82) of the Basic Skills Assessment Program legislation.

5. Teaching and Testing Our Basic Skills Objectives, Reading, Grades 9-12, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, September, 1982.*

   This publication (referred to as T & T) will provide teachers in Grades 9-12 with a tool for curriculum and instructional development that is consistent with the State Objectives in Reading. T & T provides a summary of how each objective is tested and how this information can be translated into activities for teaching basic skills.

6. Teaching and Testing Our Basic Skills Objectives, Mathematics, Grades 9-12, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, September, 1982.*

   This publication (referred to as T & T) will provide teachers in Grades 9-12 with a tool for curriculum and instructional development that is consistent with the State Objectives in Mathematics. T & T provides a summary of how each objective is tested and how this information can be translated into activities for teaching basic skills.

* These dates are the anticipated printing dates for the publications.

Forthcoming Publications (Continued)

7. Teaching and Testing Our Basic Skills Objectives, Writing, Grades 1-12, Educational Assessment Section, Office of Research, South Carolina Department of Education, September, 1982.*

   This publication (referred to as T & T) will provide teachers in Grades 1-12 with a tool for curriculum and instructional development that is consistent with the State Objectives in Writing. T & T provides a summary of how each objective is tested and how this information can be translated into activities for teaching basic skills.

* These dates are the anticipated printing dates for the publications.

Appendix B

Membership of the Kindergarten Committee

Kindergarten Objectives and Readiness Test Review and Selection Committee

Ms. Betty Addison
Kindergarten Teacher
Bishopville Primary School
Lee County School Dist.

Ms. Dorothy Lewis
First Grade Teacher
Nevitt Forest Elem. School
Anderson School Dist. #5

Ms. Elise Blakeley
First Grade Teacher
Saluda Elem. School
Saluda County School Dist.

Mr. James T. McKim
Coord. of Elem. Educ.
Charleston County School Dist.

Ms. Hazel Cadle
First Grade Teacher
East Aiken Elem. School
Aiken School Dist.

Dr. Bill Quesenbery
Director, Res. & Eval.
Charleston County School Dist.

Dr. Martha Jean Heggins
Instructor
S. C. State College

Ms. Mary Kelly
Reading Consultant
S. C. Department of Education

Ms. Emmie Atkinson
(member during 1978-79 only)
Asst. Supt. for Inst.
Marion School Dist. #1

Ms. Veter Mack
Kindergarten Teacher
Elloree Elem. School
Orangeburg School Dist. #7

Ms. Betty Brunson
Kindergarten Teacher
Forest Hills Elem. School
Colleton County School Dist.

Ms. Carol Pascua
Principal
Andrews Primary School
Georgetown County School Dist.

Ms. Phyllis Ford
Early Childhood Educ. Consult.
S. C. Deprtment of Education

Dr. Kevin Swick
Associate Professor
College of Education
University of South Carolina

Dr. Rosemary Althouse
Instructor
Winthrop College

Ms. Norma Love
First Grade Teacher
Walhalla Elem. School
Oconee County School Dist.

Ms. Katherine Brabham
Kindergarten Teacher
Ebinport Elem. School
York School Dist. #3

Ms. Sally Mullen
Kindergarten Teacher
L. B. Nelson Elem. School
Richland School Dist. #2

Ms. Betti Crosby
Primary Coordinator
Hampton School Dist. #1

Ms. Lynette Smith
First Grade Teacher
Cross Elem. School
Berkeley County School Dist.

Ms. Wanda Vickery
Kindergarten Teacher
Cades-Hebron Elem. School
Williamsburg County Schools

Note: Staff from the Educational Assessment Section (Dr. Vana H. Meredith, Chief Supervisor; Ms. Lynne Mappus, Dr. John M. Finch, and Mr. Roan Garcia-Quintana, Statisticians; and Mr. Terry L. Helsley, Mr. C. Lewie Hartley, and Ms. Pamela H. Kegley, Education Program Specialists) and from the Office of Research (Dr. Paul D. Sandifer, Director) coordinated the committee activities and served as measurement consultants.

Appendix C

1980 CSAB Readiness Results

1980 CSAB Readiness Results

Comparison of Results for 1979 and 1980

The following tables present the results of the preliminary analyses of the Fall, 1980, data. Comparable data are also provided for Fall, 1979.

Table I presents information about the numbers and percentages of students classified as "ready" or "not ready" for the total group (n = 47,697) and for each of the racial/ethnic classifications. (For ease of comparison the data for 1979 and 1980 are presented in adjacent columns.)

Table II provides data on the percentages of students classified as "ready" by the type of educational program experienced as a five-year-old and indicates the percentage of the total population that participated in each type of program.

Table III presents data for several sub-populations of students: female and male, first grade repeaters and non-repeaters, handicapped and non-handicapped, and those who were eligible for participation in the free or reduced-price lunch program.

Table IV contains descriptive statistics for the score distributions of the various subgroups and the total population.

TABLE 1

Number and Percentages of Students in Each of the Classifications "Ready", "Not Ready", and "Incomplete Data" by Racial/Ethnic Category and for the Total Group

Racial/Ethnic Category	Ready (Number) (Percent)		Not Ready (Number) (Percent)		Incomplete* (Number) (Percent)		Total (Number) (Percent)	
	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980
American Indian	17 31.5	25 46.3	33 61.1	28 51.8	4 7.4	1 1.9	54 0.1	54 0.1
Asian American	171 65.0	183 67.3	79 30.0	71 26.1	13 5.0	18 6.6	263 0.5	272 0.6
Hispanic	63 64.3	53 53.0	30 30.6	41 41.0	5 5.1	6 6.0	98 0.2	100 0.2
Black	9,398 44.7	10,310 49.6	9,997 47.5	9,232 44.4	1,652 7.8	1,267 6.1	21,047 43.4	20,809 43.6
White	19,492 72.2	19,787 74.8	6,689 24.8	6,033 22.8	802 3.0	636 2.4	26,983 55.6	26,456 55.5
Unknown	47 58.8	4 66.6	23 28.7	1 16.7	10 12.5	1 16.7	80 0.2	6 0.0
TOTALS	29,188 60.2	30,362 63.7	16,851 34.7	15,406 32.3	2,486 5.1	1,929 4.0	48,525 100.0	47,697 100.0

*NOTE: Students were placed in the "Incomplete Data" category when two conditions occurred simultaneously: 1) responses for one or more test items were not recorded on the answer form and 2) the score obtained from the available data was less than 88. If condition #1 occurred but the obtained score was 88 or more, the student was classified as "Ready".

TABLE II

Number and Percentage of Students in Each of the Classifications "Ready", "Not Ready", and "Incomplete Data" by Type of Educational Program Experienced as a Five-Year Old and for the Total Group

Type of Program	Ready (Number) (Percent)		Not Ready (Number) (Percent)		Incomplete Data (Number) (Percent)		Total (Number) (Percent)	
	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980
None	1,105 32.6	800 33.3	1,987 58.6	1,437 59.8	298 8.8	165 6.9	3,390 7.0	2,402 5.0
Public Kindergarten	22,358 61.9	24,235 64.7	12,041 33.3	11,742 31.4	1,748 4.8	1,461 3.9	36,147 74.7	37,438 78.5
Private or Non-Profit Kindergarten	3,584 79.2	3,768 81.3	820 18.1	775 16.7	121 2.7	93 2.0	4,525 9.3	4,636 9.7
Head Start	638 39.2	642 41.2	853 52.4	812 52.0	136 8.4	106 6.8	1,627 3.4	1,560 3.3
Other (Nursery Schools, etc.)	499 61.8	333 63.7	275 34.1	162 31.0	33 4.1	28 5.3	807 1.7	523 1.1
Unknown	930 48.7	576 51.1	838 43.9	477 42.3	141 7.4	74 6.6	1,909 3.9	1,127 2.4
TOTALS	29,114 60.2	30,354 63.7	16,815 34.7	15,405 32.3	2,477 5.1	1927 4.0	48,406* 100.0	47,686* 100.0

*NOTE: "Total" differs from total in Table I because the data for some students were not recorded on the response forms.

TABLE III

Number and Percentage of Students in Each of the Classifications "Ready", "Not Ready", and "Incomplete Data" by Sex, First Grade Repeater or Non-Repeater, Handicapped or Non-Handicapped, and Eligibility for Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Program

Group	Ready (Number) (Percent)		Not Ready (Number) (Percent)		Incomplete Data (Number) (Percent)		Total* (Number) (Percent)	
	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980
Female	14,876 64.3	15,509 68.1	7,168 31.0	6,520 28.6	1,098 4.7	760 3.3	23,142 47.7	22,789 47.8
Male	14,236 56.4	14,850 59.6	9,672 38.1	8,886 35.7	1,382 5.5	1,169 4.7	25,340 52.2	24,905 52.2
Repeaters	2,807 56.7	3,234 63.4	1,865 37.7	1,661 32.6	279 5.6	205 4.0	4,951 10.2	5,100 10.7
Non-Repeaters	26,279 60.5	27,123 63.7	14,956 34.4	13,739 32.3	2,195 5.1	1,723 4.0	43,430 89.8	42,585 89.3
Handicapped	614 37.7	576 41.9	876 53.8	721 52.4	139 8.5	78 5.7	1,629 3.4	1,375 2.9
Non-Handicapped	28,485 60.9	29,777 64.3	15,947 34.1	14,680 31.7	2,336 5.0	1,850 4.0	46,768 96.6	46,307 97.1
Not Eligible for Free/ Reduced Price Lunch	15,564 76.1	17,228 78.8	4,373 21.4	4,191 19.2	510 2.5	448 2.0	20,447 42.3	21,867 45.9
Eligible for Reduced Price Lunch	2,085 61.8	2,701 67.1	1,122 33.2	1,190 29.5	169 5.0	137 29.5	3,376 7.0	4,028 8.4
Eligible for Free Lunch	7,607 42.6	10,405 47.8	8,798 49.2	10,012 46.0	1,461 8.2	1,343 6.2	17,866 36.9	21,760 45.7

*NOTE: Number and percentage for subgroups may differ from state totals due to incomplete data for some students, e.g. information on eligibility for free/reduced-price lunch programs was not available for 6,836 students in 1979.

TABLE IV

Means, Medians, Modes, Standard Deviations, and Minimum and Maximum Score by Racial/Ethnic Category and for Total Group

Racial/Ethnic Category	Mean		Median		Mode		Standard Deviation		Minimum Obtained Score		Maximum Obtained Score	
	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980
American Indian	80.0	83.6	81	86.5	Multi Modal	99	14.8	19.1	37	20	102	111
Asian American	90.1	89.2	93	94	Multi Modal	97	16.5	20.2	0	0	114	114
Hispanic	89.9	86.2	91	91.5	Multi Modal	99	13.5	20.4	35	0	115	112
Black	83.8	85.2	86	87	88	91	14.9	14.7	5	5	117	117
White	92.9	93.7	95	96	98	97	12.5	12.2	0	0	117	117
Unknown	86.3	88.3	90	93.5	91	96	16.3	11.2	37	69	113	97
TOTALS	88.9	89.9	91	92.0	95	97	14.3	14.0	0	0	117	117

Appendix D

Writing Scoring Process, Holistic Scoring Guide,
and Analytic Scoring Guide

WRITING SCORING PROCESS

The Basic Skills Writing Tests which were administered in Grades 6 and 8 and which will be administered in Grade 11, consisted of presenting each student with a writing prompt and having each student write a paper based upon that prompt.

All writing papers are read and scored by at least two readers. Each reader independently assigns each paper a score using South Carolina's 0-4 point Modified Holistic Scoring Scale. The five score points on this 0-4 point scale include:

4 = a more than adequate response
3 = an adequate response
2 = a less than adequate response
1 = a very inadequate response
0 = a response that cannot be evaluated

Hence, the cutoff point of adequate versus inadequate falls between the scores of 3 and 2 on the Modified Holistic Scoring Scale.

If a paper is rated as inadequate (receives a score of 2 or below), the paper must also be scored using South Carolina's Analytic Scoring Scale which pinpoints those objectives in which the student exhibited deficiencies and needs additional work. Those objectives that are cited as inadequate by the two readers are combined and are reported, along with the overall Writing score.

If the two readers' scores for a student's paper fall on the same side of the adequate/inadequate cutoff, then the two scores are averaged for a final score. In the case where one reader assigns the paper an adequate score (3 or 4) and the other reader assigns the paper an inadequate score (2 or below), the paper receives a third independent reading by a new reader. The two scores that fall on the same side of the adequate/inadequate cutoff point are averaged for the paper's final score.

If a paper receives a final rating of inadequate (2 or below), the analytic ratings of each of the two readers that are in agreement are combined and reported as the objectives in which the student has deficiencies.

In the special case where one reader assigns a paper a 0 and the other reader assigns the same paper any other score (1, 2, 3, 4), that paper receives a third independent reading.

Included in the remainder of Appendix D are the following:

1. Modified Holistic Scoring Guide
2. Writing Score Interpretation
3. Analytic Scoring Guide

SOUTH CAROLINA BASIC SKILLS ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
MODIFIED HOLISTIC SCORING GUIDE
GRADES SIX, EIGHT, AND ELEVEN

4 points = A more than adequate response

The paper is written on the assigned topic. It has a focus and is unified with a beginning and an end. The reader moves smoothly from idea to idea.

The paper is developed in a manner that fully responds to the main type of writing requested. (That is, narration communicates an elaborated sequence of events; description communicates appropriate, varied, and original details; exposition communicates a clear explanation; persuasion communicates a convincing argument.) The specified audience has been addressed appropriately.

If there are any errors in sentence formation, word usage, or mechanics, those errors do not detract from the meaning of the response.

3 points = An adequate response

The paper is written on the assigned topic. It has a focus and is unified, with a beginning and an end. The reader does not encounter major obstacles in moving from idea to idea.

The paper is developed in a manner that is appropriate to the main type of writing requested. (That is, narration communicates a sequence of events; description communicates a series of related details; exposition communicates an explanation; persuasion communicates a series of related reasons.) The specified audience has been addressed appropriately.

Errors in sentence formation, word usage, and mechanics may be present, but they do not substantially detract from the meaning of the response.

2 points = A less than adequate response

The paper is written on the assigned topic. It is somewhat unified and focused, although it may not have a beginning or end. The reader may encounter obstacles in moving from idea to idea.

The paper is developed in a manner that only barely meets the requirements of the main type of writing requested. (That is, narration communicates a skeletal sequence of events, with no elaboration; description communicates very few appropriate details; exposition communicates an explanation that is unclear; persuasion communicates very few appropriate reasons.) The specified audience may not be addressed at all, or may be addressed inappropriately.

Errors in sentence formation, word usage, and mechanics may be frequent or serious enough to detract from the meaning of the response.

1 point = A very inadequate response

The paper is related to the topic but it is disorganized and lacks a focus. The reader finds it very difficult to follow.

The paper does not meet the requirements of the main type of writing requested. It may either respond with an inappropriate type of writing (for example, present a narrative in response to a persuasive task) or respond with something that cannot be classified as any one of the four types of writing. If any audience is addressed it is not the specified one.

There are numerous serious errors in sentence formation, word usage, and mechanics.

0 points = A response that cannot be evaluated

Either there is no response or the response is illegible or entirely unrelated to the assigned topic.

WRITING SCORE INTERPRETATION

4 or 3 =	Adequate	Although a student receives an adequate score in writing, she/he may still need improvement in any of the writing objectives.
2 or 1 =	Inadequate	A score of 2 or 1 will be accompanied by an indication of the writing objectives in which the student needs the most help.

2 with * for Composition Objective only - The writing was developed in a manner other than the type of writing requested.

1 with * for Composition Objective only - There was an insufficient response.

0 =	Inadequate	A paper receives a score of zero (0) for one of the five following reasons:

1. not on the topic,
2. explicit refusal to follow the assignment,
3. implicit refusal to follow the assignment,
4. totally blank papers, or
5. illegible papers

SOUTH CAROLINA BASIC SKILLS ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
ANALYTIC SCORING GUIDE
GRADES SIX, EIGHT, AND ELEVEN

Check ( ) areas
that are inadquate

a. COMPOSITION: The paper is written on the assigned topic. It has a focus and is unified, with a beginning and an end. The response is developed in a manner appropriate to the main type of writing requested (i.e., narration communicates a sequence of events; description communicates a series of related details; exposition communicates an explanation; persuasion communicates a series of related reasons). The specified audience has been appropriately addressed.

b. SENTENCE FORMATION: Complete sentences are used.

c. WORD USAGE: Words are appropriate in their meaning and grammatical form for the context in which they are used.

d. MECHANICS: Spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are correct.

e. HANDWRITING: The paper is legible.

Appendix E

1981 BSAP Test Results

TABLE I

MEAN[a]/MEDIAN[b] RAW SCORES[c] BY
GRADE FOR EACH READING AND MATHEMATICS
OBJECTIVE AND FOR EACH OF THE TOTAL TESTS

			GRADE		
Reading	1	2	3	6	8
Decoding and Word Meaning	5.4[a]/5.8[b]	5.0/5.3	5.0/5.5	4.6/4.9	4.4/4.7
Details	3.8/3.9	4.6/5.4	4.9/5.4	4.5/4.9	4.4/4.8
Main Idea	4.6/5.1	3.9/4.0	4.1/4.5	3.4/3.5	3.9/4.1
Reference Usage	4.8/5.6	4.6/5.2	4.6/5.0	4.9/5.3	4.5/4.9
Inference	4.3/4.6	4.3/5.0	4.6/5.2	3.6/3.8	3.8/4.0
Analysis of Literature	3.5/3.5	4.1/4.6	4.2/4.4	3.0/2.9	3.5/3.6
Total Test	26.4/27.5	26.6/29.2	27.4/29.8	24.0/24.7	24.4/25.7
Number Tested	47,513	45,569	47,025	46,683	46,973
Mathematics	1	2	3	6	8
Concepts	4.9/5.0	5.0/5.3	4.3/4.5	3.0/3.0	2.5/2.3
Operations	4.7/5.1	4.7/5.0	4.1/4.5	3.5/3.6	3.3/3.3
Measurement	5.2/5.5	5.1/5.3	4.6/4.7	3.1/3.1	2.9/2.9
Geometry	5.4/5.7	5.5/5.7	5.0/5.2	2.7/2.6	2.4/2.3
Problem Solving	5.3/5.7	5.4/5.7	4.5/4.8	3.7/4.0	2.8/2.6
Total Test	25.5/26.6	25.6/26.7	22.5/23.1	16.2/16.0	14.0/12.8
Number Tested	47,448	45,521	46,980	46,621	46,827

[a] Mean -- Average score obtained by adding all scores and dividing the sum by the number of students tested.

[b] Median -- The point above and below which 50% of the students scored.

[c] Raw Score -- Number of correct responses. Each objective was assessed with six items. Each of the reading and mathematics tests consisted of 36 and 30 items, respectively.

TABLE II

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF STUDENTS SCORING "ABOVE STANDARD"[a] OR "BELOW STANDARD" ON WRITING BY GRADE

Grade	Above Standard (Number) (Percent)	Below Standard (Number) (Percent)	Number Tested
6	20,425 44	26,195 56	46,620
8	14,930 32	32,001 68	46,931

[a]Writing responses were scored on a 0-4 scale using a "modified-holistic" approach to scoring. Papers receiving scores of 3 or above were judged to be "above standard"; papers receiving scores less than 3 were judged to be "below standard".

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME THAT SHOULD[a] BE DEVOTED BY GRADE TO EACH OBJECTIVE WITHIN THE SUBJECT AREAS OF READING, MATHEMATICS AND WRITING

SUBJECT AREA AND OBJECTIVE	GRADE				
	1	2	3	6	8
Reading					
Dec. & W.M.	42	36	31	23	21
Details	21	22	22	21	19
Main Idea	16	17	18	22	22
Ref. Usage	7	9	12	14	13
Inference	9	9	10	12	13
An. of Lit.	6	6	7	9	11
Mathematics					
Concepts	34	29	25	24	24
Operations	35	35	36	37	34
Measurement	11	13	13	12	13
Geometry	9	9	9	10	11
Prob. Solv.	10	14	16	17	18
Writing					
Handwriting	47	31	23	12	8
Mechanics	19	25	26	25	24
Word Usage	14	17	18	22	23
Sent. Form.	12	17	19	21	23
Composition	8	11	13	20	22

[a]Percentages are based on judgments of South Carolina teachers as to the instructional emphasis each objective should receive.

TABLE IV

NUMBER[a] AND PERCENTAGE OF BELOW STANDARD WRITING PAPERS EXHIBITING DEFICIENCIES ON EACH WRITING OBJECTIVE[b] BY GRADE

GRADE	OBJECTIVE			
	MECHANICS	WORD USAGE	SENTENCE FORMATION	COMPOSITION
6	22,384	17,816	22,920	7,262
N = 26,195	85%	68%	87%	28%
8	23,576	25,780	23,000	18,395
N = 32,001	74%	81%	73%	57%

[a]In most instances "Below Standard" papers had deficiencies in more than one area. Consequently, addition of numbers across objectives will result in a sum larger than the total number of below standard papers.

[b]Handwriting was considered deficient only if the writing was illegible in which case the paper received a score of "0". Since a score of "0" was also assigned for other reasons such as the student refusing to write, data are not available for the number of papers on which the writing was illegible.

Appendix F

Basic Skills Reading, Writing, and Mathematics Committees

Basic Skills Reading Committee

Mrs. Eva Summers
Clarendon School Dist. 1

Kay M. Currin
Florence School Dist. 3

Ms. Darlene Martin
Lamar Elementary
Darlington County Schools

Ms. Lynn Owen
Wren Middle
Anderson School Dist. 1

Mrs. Etta H. Mixon
Barnwell Elementary
Barnwell School Dist. 45

Mrs. Thomasena Strickland
Gadsden Elementary
Richland School Dist. 1

Mr. Jack A. LeGrand
Chapin High
Lexington School Dist. 5

Mrs. Doris Bagwell
Loris High
Horry County School Dist.

Mr. Frank Austell
Spartanburg High
Spartanburg School Dist. 7

Dr. Elizabeth B. Galloway
Clemson University

Mrs. Agnes R. Copeland
Marshall Elementary
Orangeburg School Dist. 5

Ms. Marguerite Holloway
Scranton Elementary
Florence School Dist. 3

Mrs. Geraldine Kenner
Blaney Elementary
Kershaw County School Dist.

Ms. Frances Cochran
Palmetto Middle
Anderson School Dist. 1

Ms. Mary Lou Beaty
Harold C. Johnson Middle
York School Dist. 1

Mrs. Lillias Means
Emerald Junior High
Greenwood School Dist. 50

Mrs. Kirsten G. Dixon
Sumter High
Sumter School Dist. 17

Mrs. Jessie Williams
Green Sea-Floyds High
Horry County School Dist.

Dr. Charles Matthews
College of Charleston

Ms. Shirley Palmer
Sumter School Dist. 2

Mrs. Viola McMorris
Whittaker Elementary
Orangeburg School Dist. 5

Ms. Gloria Johnson
Cain Elementary
Darlington County School Dist.

Mrs. Trudy Thompson
Camden Elementary
Kershaw County School Dist.

Miss Mary Kelly
Reading Consultant
S. C. Department of Education

Ms. Susan O'Neal
Harold C. Johnson Middle
York School Dist. 1

Mrs. Susan C. Fedor
Irmo Middle
Lexington School Dist. 5

Dr. Susan Smith
Reading Consultant
S. C. Department of Education

Ms. Ora Broadnax
Ridge Spring-Monetta Elementary
Aiken County School Dist.

Dr. Rebecca Swanson
Columbia College

Basic Skills Writing Committee

Mr. Wayne Radcliff
Hartsville High
Darlington County School Dist.

Mrs. Barbara Rabb
Greenville School Dist.

Ms. Susie Bruton
Secondary Language Arts
Horry County Schools

Mrs. May Jones
Charleston County School Dist.

Mrs. Ethel Washington
Baptist Hill High
Charleston County School Dist.

Mrs. Jean Bentley
Ft. Johnson High
Charleston County School Dist.

Ms. Vicki N. Hollifield
Brunson Elementary
Hampton School Dist. 1

Mrs. Thelma Deveaux
Hampton School Dist. 2

Mrs. Sandra Jenkinson Derrick
Bonaire Elementary
Florence School Dist. 1

Ms. Debra Buckner
Lester Elementary
Florence School Dist. 1

Ms. Barbara W. Cooper
Southside
Marion School Dist. 1

Mr. James A. Wilhide
English Consultant
S.C. Department of Education

Ms. Ernestine L. Yeadon
W.E. Parker Elementary
Edgefield County School Dist.

Ms. Rita Smith
Broad River Elementary
Beaufort County School Dist.

Dr. Patricia T. Candal
Georgetown County School Dist.

Dr. Betty Hodges
U.S.C. - Lancaster Campus

Mrs. Becky McCullough
Corinth Elementary
Cherokee County Schools

Mrs. Cornelia Vickery
McCants Junior High
Anderson School Dist. 5

Mrs. Mary C. Smith
Easley Junior High
Pickens County School Dist.

Ms. Lucille Clayton
R. C. Edwards Jr. High
Pickens County School Dist.

Ms. Lynn Scott
Spring Valley High
Richland School Dist. 2

Mrs. Marion C. Mack
Spring Valley High
Richland School Dist. 2

Ms. Anne M. Summerall
Mayewood High
Sumter School Dist. 2

Mrs. Idalla Bodie
South Aiken High
Aiken County School Dist.

Dr. Elizabeth J. Hart
Benedict College

Mr. David Banaszak
Lakeside Junior High
Anderson School Dist. 5

Ms. Lottie Chishom
Hanberry-Bethel
Richland School Dist. 2

Ms. Judy Houk
Whitlock Jr. High
Spartanburg School Dist. 7

Dr. Nancy Thompson
U.S.C. - Columbia Campus

Mrs. Ann Rex
Secondary Language Arts
Horry County School Dist.

Basic Skills Mathematics Committee

Ms. Carol T. Ellis
Mathematics Specialist
Spartanburg School Dist. 7

Mrs. Betty McDaniel, Coord.
Secondary Mathematics
Florence School Dist. 1

Mrs. Julia D. Robbins
Director of Mathematics
York School Dist. 3

Mrs. Emma Strickland
York School Dist. 3

Mr. William James Riley
Bowman High
Orangeburg School Dist. 2

Mr. Scottie Moore
Barnwell Elementary
Barnwell School Dist. 45

Ms. Martha H. Lister
Bobo Elementary
Spartanburg School Dist. 6

Ms. Peggy T. West
Roebuck Primary
Spartanburg School Dist. 6

Mrs. Mary W. Stuart
Anderson School Dist. 3

Miss Amy Burton
Starr Elementary
Anderson School Dist. 3

Mrs. Jane N. Brigman
Central Elementary
Lancaster County School Dist.

Mrs. Margaret T. Patterson
Clinton Elementary
Lancaster County School Dist.

Ms. Clara Hipp
Hollywood School
Saluda County School Dist.

Mr. James R. C. Calhoun
J. V. Martin Jr. High
Dillon School Dist. 2

Mr. Daniel H. Sandel
Mathematics Consultant
S. C. Department of Education

Mrs. Cornelia Roberts
J. V. Martin Jr. High
Dillon School Dist. 2

Mr. Johnny Davis
Georgetown County School Dist.

Mr. Robert C. Parker
Winyah Senior High
Georgetown County School Dist.

Mrs. Mary O. Merrick
H. E. McCracken High
Beaufort County School Dist.

Mr. James A. Johnson
Beaufort High
Beaufort County School Dist.

Dr. Joseph C. Tisdale
Winthrop College

Mrs. Jean Phillips
Walhalla Sr. High
Oconee County School Dist.

Mrs. Jacqueline Turner
Hand Middle
Richland School Dist. 1

Mrs. Josephine Williams
Fairwold Middle
Richland School Dist. 1

Mr. William B. Hynds
Mathematics Consultant
S. C. Department of Education

Appendix G

Membership of the
Basic Skills Advisory Commission

BASIC SKILLS ADVISORY COMMISSION

GOVERNOR'S APPOINTEES

Congressional District I

Mrs. Esther Pickering, 1217 Ravenel Drive, Charleston, SC 29407

Congressional District II

Ms. Joy Sovde, 1017 Daly Street, Columbia, SC 29205

Congressional District III

Mr. Harold D. Breazeale, Route 3, Pickens, SC 29671

Congressional District IV

Mrs. W. Harrison Trammell, 206 Riverbend Apts., Cleveland Street, Greenville, SC 29601

Congressional District V

Mr. C. Charles Cole, 324 2nd Street, Cheraw, SC 29520

Congressional District VI

Dr. James Mahaffey, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Horry County Schools, Drawer 1739, Conway, SC 29526

Member-at-Large

Dr. Noble Cooper, 2212 Pinehurst Road, Columbia, SC 29204

STATE SUPERINTENDENT'S APPOINTEES

Congressional District I

Dr. Billie Holladay, Division of Instruction, Charleston County Schools, 3 Chisolm Street, Charleston, SC 29401

Congressional District II

Mrs. Ethel Finley, Carver Elementary School, 2100 Waverly Street, Columbia, SC 29204

Congressional District III

Mrs. Nelle Taylor, Curriculum Coordinator, Saluda County Schools, 404 North Wise Road, Saluda, SC 29138

Congressional District IV

Dr. J. G. McCracken, Superintendent, Spartanburg School District #7, P. O. Box 970, Spartanburg, SC 29304

Congressional District V

Mrs. Barbara Joan Stevenson, Fort Mill Elementary School, Box 663, Fort Mill, SC 29715

Congressional District VI

Mr. James A. Blake, Marion School Distict #1, 616 Northside Avenue, Marion, SC 29571

LT. GOVERNOR'S APPOINTEES

Ms. Maggie Bender, 1107 Vincent Drive, Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464

Dr. Beatrice Thompson, 1111 Southwood Street, Anderson, SC 29601

Dr. Alma Byrd, 2327 Willow Street, Columbia, SC 29203

Mr. Wallace Brown, 130 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, SC 29902 -- Chairman

The Honorable David E. Turnipseed, 251 Magnolia Street, Spartanburg, SC 29301

The Honorable David Taylor, Box 46, Laurens, SC 29360

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE APPOINTEES

Rep. Joseph R. Murray, Box 321, Charleston, SC 29402

The Honorable Danny M. Bruce, Box 96, Campobello, SC 29322

Mr. Hugh B. Betchman, Jr., Box 1661, Sumter, SC 29150

Mrs. Mary McDonald Harper, P. O. Box 457, Estill, SC 29918

Mr. M. Hayes Mizell, 1338 Main Street, Suite 501, Columbia, SC 29201 -- Vice-Chairman

Dr. Willis Crosby, P. O. Box 1273, Greenville, SC 29602 -- Secretary